

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.usptc.gov

APPLICATION NO	D	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/836,576		04/16/2001	Elaine L. Jacobson	NIAD-213.1	6712	
24972	7590	09/29/2003				
		AWORSKI, LLP	EXAMINER			
666 FIFTI NEW YO		10103-3198		SAUCIER, S	SAUCIER, SANDRA E	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1651		

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/836,576	JACOBSON ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sandra Saucier	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2003 FAILS TO PLATHEREOF, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Oftimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for a later than SIX MONTHS from the mail as FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF the date on which the petition under 37 C of extension and the corresponding and the shortened statutory period for replace later than three months after the m	ing date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension rount of the fee. The appropriate extension y originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:	
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. igotimes Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s): New matter rejection.	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: <u>it i</u>		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: none.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8-10 and 12</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 11.		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.
9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	\rightarrow
0. Other:		Sandra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1651

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Extensive amendments to the pending claims would require further consideration concerning reinstatement of prior art rejection..